



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

following up the latest train of thought, he at last comes upon the truth in a form which even he can grasp at once, and, in his agony at that vision, to which for the first time in his life he has now attained, he cries out: 'Oh, Oh! All brought to pass—all true! Thou light, may I now look my last upon thee—I who have been found accursed in birth, accursed in wedlock, accursed in the shedding of blood'. In a final act of mad energy, he puts out the eyes which could not see, and demands the execution upon himself of the doom which he alone had decreed. In the representation of Sophocles, this is the end of a great-souled man, endowed with all the gifts of nature, but heedless of the true reason in accordance with which the magnanimous man of Aristotle finds his way to perfect virtue or happiness.

Perhaps we are not entirely reconciled to the fate of Oedipus. Perhaps the downfall of a tragic hero never wholly satisfies the individual reader's sense of justice, for the poet, by the necessity of his art, is bound to make the particular embodiment of a universal truth as terrible and as pitiful as he can. Surely this result is attained in the *Oedipus Rex*. Every sympathetic reader will agree with Aristotle that, 'even without the aid of the eye, he who hears the tale told will thrill with horror and melt to pity at what takes place'. Whatever 'fatalism' there may be in the drama—in the oracles, for instance, and in the performance of the prophesied crimes by Oedipus in ignorance of circumstances—directly increases the tragic effect. Aristotle himself mentions crimes committed in ignorance of particulars as deeds which especially arouse pity. The oracles, such a source of trouble to those who muddle their heads with Greek 'fatalism', have a threefold function. They have a large share in the dramatic irony for which *Oedipus Rex* is so famous, and which is a powerful instrument for arousing tragic fear. They serve as a stimulus to set the hero's own nature in motion without determining whether the direction of the motion shall be right or wrong. And lastly, they point out in clear and impressive language the course of the story. Shakespeare in *Macbeth* and Hamlet introduces less simple and probable forms of the supernatural, for similar purposes. The oracles of Sophocles, like the ghosts and witches of Shakespeare, are but necessary means for attaining an end. The representation of their effect upon the action of the characters is not the end of the drama, and must not be so regarded. They embody the final teaching of the poet as little as the words of particular dramatic characters, in particular circumstances, express the poet's own unbiased thought and feeling.

The central conception of the *Oedipus Rex* is plainly no more fatalistic than the philosophy of Aristotle. If any reader finds the doctrine hard, he may remember that Sophocles himself completed

it somewhat as the Christian Church completed Aristotle, and, in the representation of the death of Oedipus at Colonus, crowned the law with grace. Nevertheless, for the understanding not only of Sophocles, but of the great 'master of those who know' the laws of life and art, it seems important to recognize the relation between these two ideal conceptions—the magnanimous man of the Ethics, ideal for life, the tragic hero of the Poetics, ideal for death. According to Aristotle, the man who attains perfect happiness in the world is the wise man who sees in all their aspects the facts or the forces with which he is dealing, and can balance and direct his own impulses in accordance with reason. In the *Oedipus Rex* Sophocles had already shown the reverse. The man who sees but one side of a matter, and straightway, driven on by his uncontrolled emotions, acts in accordance with that imperfect vision, meets a fate most pitiful and terrible, in accordance with the great laws which the gods have made.

This philosophy of Aristotle and Sophocles is clearly expressed in the drama itself. 'May destiny still find me', sings the Chorus, 'winning the praise of reverent purity in all words and deeds sanctioned by those laws of range sublime, called into life throughout the high, clear heaven, whose father is Olympus alone; their parent was no race of mortal men, no, nor shall oblivion ever lay them to sleep: the god is mighty in them and grows not old'.

MARJORIE BARSTOW.

## REVIEWS

Horace, *The Epistles*. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Edward P. Morris. New York: American Book Company (1911). Pp. 239. Price (with *Satires*) \$1.25.

In 1909 Professor Morris published an edition of Horace's *Satires* (reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3.229); he now edits the *Epistles*, and the two are issued in a single volume. In conformity with the plan adopted for other books in the same series the notes accompany the text—one can hardly say that they are at the foot of the page, for almost always they occupy at least half of the available space. By this I do not mean to imply that they are too full; on the contrary it is obvious that the editor has endeavored to be succinct and to present only that which is of direct value to the student. The recent edition of Kiessling, revised by Heinze (1908), shows how much more voluminous a commentary on the *Epistles* may be and still avoid, for the most part, the seductive by-paths of irrelevant pedantry.

The text of these poems does not present many difficulties; originality on the part of the editor is here hardly possible. Perhaps we can detect in Professor Morris a tendency to adopt even more of

Bentley's brilliant conjectures than other editors have been willing to accept. For example, in 1. 2. 5 we find *detinet*; in 1. 15. 13 *equis*; in 1. 17. 43 *sua*; in 2. 2. 212 *levat*; in 2. 3. 423 *artis*. Some of these, to be sure, are found in certain of the manuscripts, and the last two are also printed in Kiessling-Heinze. Other readings in preferring which Professor Morris differs from most editors are 1. 5. 16 *designat* (*dissignat*); 1. 18. 111 *donat* (*ponit*); 2. 1. 69 *delendaque* (*delendave*); 2. 2. 16 *laedit* (*laedit*); 2. 3. 339 *volet* (*velit*); 2. 2. 355 *et citharoedus* (*ut citharoedus*); 2. 3. 450 *nec* (*non*). With Bentley, in 2. 3 Professor Morris puts verse 45 after 46; in 2. 1 he follows Lachmann in placing verse 101 after 107.

The introduction, although limited to about seven pages, is well-written, and abounds in stimulating suggestions. Horace's development of the Alcaic stanza, as seen for instance in the group of patriotic odes at the beginning of the Third Book, is compared to his adaptation of the Lucilian satire. The origin of the poetic epistle as a literary form is treated tentatively, for the facts do not warrant dogmatic statement. An interesting note at this point is to the effect that "no distinct line can be seen between the manner in which Lucretius addresses Memmius at intervals in the *De Rerum Natura* and the occasional address to the Pisones in the *Ars Poetica*". Especially admirable is the exposition of the artistic problem which Horace had to face in constructing the Epistles: the fusing of the personal and the impersonal, that is, the introduction into the framework of a letter addressed to an individual of subject-matter which should attract and edify the general reader. In the First Book, the main theme of which is philosophy, Horace solved this problem in various ways; in the Second, which is devoted to literary criticism, he abandons to a large extent the attitude of sympathetic friend writing advice and suggestion of a partially private nature, and ascends the cathedra, to speak with authority to the literary public of Rome as the recognized dean of Latin letters.

Professor Morris analyzes Horace's dicta of the Second Book into three elements, first, the traditional literary history together with the conventional principles of rhetoric, which he considers of comparatively little significance and vitality; secondly, the tendencies of contemporary literature; and thirdly, the personal judgments of Horace himself, based upon his own experience. Professor Morris is inclined to over-value the last two of these at the expense of the first. No one, however, would dispute that so great a poet as Horace, and especially one so conscious of the ways and means of his art, is an excellent guide and teacher. But although we readily admit the main contention of the statement that "for the work of the critic he was all the

better qualified because his own work was not inspired, but was the result of a conscious process", yet are conscious art and inspiration mutually exclusive, and can a poet be so great as the ages have proved Horace without being gifted with inspiration, even though it be not of the fire-and-flame, Catullan variety?

Preceding each epistle is a special introduction, giving the circumstances under which the poem was written, various facts or conjectures about the person to whom it is addressed, and finally a fairly elaborate paraphrase of its contents. I cannot see the need or advisability of such a paraphrase; instead of allowing the thought to flash directly from the Latin to the student's consciousness, the summary furnishes him certain initial ideas to which he clings as to a crutch. Consequently through the removal of the stimulus afforded by the difficulty of tackling new Latin his interest is deadened—the bloom is off the peach. It would be better to furnish at the beginning merely the necessary data regarding the time of writing and the person addressed, and then to append an outline of the thought, as brief and as clear-cut as possible, at the very end. Aside from these paraphrases, the introductions are excellent; the conclusions drawn by Professor Morris concerning the contents are both sane and well-presented; if at times we are irritated by a confusion of thought, by needless repetitions, by inconsistencies, by blurred outlines, the culprit is Horace himself, who, in his endeavor to produce apparently unstudied disquisitions on life and learning, has deliberately cast aside rigid unity and systematic development of thought; and yet it is to this very free and easy method of literary progression that the author owes many of his happiest effects. It is, accordingly, by no means easy to give the gist of certain of the Epistles in a few words.

The notes are adapted to the students for whom this edition is intended; they are clear, brief, and to the point. Grammatical peculiarities are not over-emphasized; the number of cross-references is comparatively small. In only a few instances does the interpretation seem faulty. For example, in 1. 6. 7 it seems better to take *ludicra* as accusative, as appositive to *plausus* and *dona*, than to make it an appositional genitive. In 2. 3. 11 Professor Morris explains *vicissim* as "we poets expect it from painters, and we also grant it to them", but the contrast is rather between artists (both painters and poets) and critics; as Acron says, "*petimus quasi poetae, damus quasi critici*", that is, artists demand certain licenses and they in turn, when judging the works of others, grant similar privileges. In 2. 3. 163 Professor Morris does not connect *flecti* with *cereus*, contrary to the custom of most editors. The comment on 2. 1. 31,

*nil intra est oleam, nil extra est in nuce duri,*

"The same kind of argument from analogy would prove that as a nut is hard outside and soft inside so an olive must be the same", is somewhat misleading because the statement is incomplete. The Latin is very concise, but the thought is as follows: the reasoning described in the preceding verses is defective and would lead to absurdities; just as if, because both the olive and the nut grow on trees, we should infer the structure of either one from that of the other, if we were to say, that is, that the olive like the nut must be soft within, or, starting with the olive, to conclude that the exterior of the nut must be soft.

The notes to 2. 2 and 2. 3 (*Ars Poetica*) should be more comprehensive, in so far as they deal with the origins and the development of Greek and Latin literature. Here is an opportunity to give the student a systematic view of the literary history of Greece and Rome; not only the traditional accounts should be considered, but the established results of modern investigation in this field should at least be referred to. The place of the *Ars Poetica* in the history of literary criticism of Europe should be stated, and appreciations of it by some of the best authorities given. I believe that in handling these last two epistles Professor Morris has not made the most of the opportunities afforded by his valuable subject-matter.

The book is attractive in appearance and well-printed; the only errors that I have noticed are the omission of the period at the end of verse 54 of 2. 1 and *titigisse* for *tetigisse* in 2. 3. 455.

HAROLD L. CLEASBY.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY.

Greece in Evolution. London: T. Fisher Unwin (1909).

Greek Immigration to the United States. By Henry Pratt Fairchild. New Haven: Yale University Press.

One of the marked characteristics of classical study during the present generation is the widening of the field so as to include, beside the periods of bloom and perfection of literature and art, as for instance the ages of Pericles and Augustus, the study of the peoples dwelling on Hellenic and on Italic soil in prehistoric times. The mutual influence of Greece and Rome upon each other must also be considered, if we would understand the complex origin of European peoples during their formative period in medieval times.

Furthermore, the power to appreciate and to make clear to others the classical elements permanently embedded in our modern life should be a most effective weapon in the hands of classical teachers in convincing the public of the importance of the study of Latin and Greek in our schools and colleges.

As the study of modern Greek and Italian throws

light on the ancient tongues, so a knowledge of the people dwelling in classic lands and inheriting classic traditions must help us to a better understanding of the character of the old Greeks and Romans.

Two books have recently appeared which treat of the modern Greek people from extremely different points of view.

One volume, entitled *Greece in Evolution*, consists of a collection of studies prepared under the auspices of the French League for the Defence of Hellenism, translated from the French, with a preface by Sir Charles Dilke.

In a series of essays marked by lucidity, learning, justice and enthusiasm, the several writers present, in an indirect way, a strong case in favor of the territorial claims of Greece and of the peaceful adjustment of vexed political questions between Turkey and Greece, questions which could have been settled years ago but for the selfishness and the timidity of the Great Powers.

A bare citation of the contents of the book for the purpose of increasing the interest of classical teachers in the Hellenic cause is all that can here be attempted.

Chapter 1: Why we love Greece, by Theophile Homolle. This is an introduction to the book containing the confession of faith of these French 'Philhellenes' in the generous cause which they one and all are advocating. "We love the Greece of antiquity from gratitude—the gratitude due to one who has educated humanity; and we love the Greece of to-day, with all the hope of which we are capable, as the elected heiress of the Greece of old". These words form the keynote in the enthusiastic and illuminating description of the progress of Greece during the last twenty-five years as seen by the eyes of one possessing keen insight into the intellectual work of ancient Greece, and an ardent sympathy with the national aspirations of the Greece of to-day.

Chapter 2: The Greek Church and Hellenism, by Charles Diehl. The services of the Orthodox Church in the cause of Christianity and of nationalism here set forth enables us better to understand the very strong hold which their national religion has on the hearts of the people.

Chapters 3 and 5 show the prevalence of the spirit of Hellenism in Turkish Asia and in Macedonia and furnish a strong argument for the future restoration to the kingdom of Greece of certain regions now forming a part of the Turkish Empire.

In Chapter 4, *Picturesque Greece*, the writer, Gustave Fougères, attempts the well-nigh impossible task of painting for us in words the scenery of sea and mountain, romantic ruins and historic sites, all bathed in the translucent atmosphere of Greece.

Chapters 7 and 9 tell us of the economic progress at home and abroad and predict the important rôle